

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the non-final Office Action issued 12 July 2010. Reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-18 are requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. The indication that claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, 12 and 15 are allowed is greatly appreciated.

Claims 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The § 112 Rejection

Claims 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b). More specifically, the Office Action states that **claim 3** is vague in its recital of “by which a user to prevent . . . “ As noted above, claim 3 has been amended to address the specified phrase to read “by which a user can prevent . . .” In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3.

The Office Action also states that **claim 5** refers to “said electronic module” in line 7 but that the module is first recited in line 8. As noted above, claim 5 has been amended to move the limitation of “wherein said reference electrode is integrally formed with said electronics module” to the end of claim 5. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5.

The Office Action also states that **claim 7** is vague in that the top and bottom surfaces as well as the conductive pads have previously been set forth in claim 1. As noted above, claim 7 has been cancelled. In light of the foregoing, the rejection of claim 7 is rendered moot.

Finally, the Office Action states that the phrase “detects and alarm condition” in **claim 16** is vague. As set forth above, claim 16 has been amended to

read “detects an alarm condition.” In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16.

Claims 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, and 18 ultimately depend from claims that are respectfully submitted as being allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, and 18

37 CFR 1.77(b)

37 CFR 1.77(b) sets forth *recommended* section headings. The applicant respectfully declines to use such section headings.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 1-6 and 8-18 distinguish patentably over the references of record and meet all statutory requirements. An early allowance of all claims is requested.

If any extension of time is necessary in connection with this paper, Applicants respectfully petition for such extension. If any fees are required in connection with this paper, the authorization to charge deposit account 14-1270 for the fees associated therewith is hereby provided.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas M. Lundin/

Thomas M. Lundin
Reg. No. 48,979
Philips Intellectual Property and Standards
595 Miner Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44143
T: 440-483-4281
F: 440-483-2452